

Public Works (1897) Department.

G.O., No. 8224

DATED 22 March 1897

[Despatch Abstract.]

Courier and allowance. The grant of a - of
Rs. 30 per annum each to conductor C. Smith
and sub C. J. W. Plummer, sanctioned
with effect from the date on which they
entered on their duties in the Lighthouse
Dⁿ.

S.S. Co. 105 ✓ 203/3/9-
Sun Nov 2 ✓

P. W. D.

note for H. E. the Govt

The conveyance etc. may be granted,
on the merits of the application itself.
I do not think Mr. Ashpitel's ground
of justification is a sound one.

A. S. H.

17.3.97

The figures given
in Mr. Evers' note of 13.3.97
are correct, but in
stating that Conductor
Smith will be put to
loss by a refusal to
grant him a conveyance
allowance while serving
at the Presidency, Mr.
Ashpitel doubtless
sets aside altogether
the sums of Rs 50 & Rs 20
drawn as Presidency allow-
& House rent. These
allowances are granted
to cover the increased
cost of living at the
Presidency town, and
therefore Rs 300 per annum
in the Mofussil must
be regarded as equiva-
lent to Rs 370 per annum
at Madras.

~~S. A. W.~~
S. A. W.

while in charge of
 the Grade subdivision,
 Mr. Smith drew, in
 addition to his sub-
 divisional allowance of
 Rs 30, a horse allowance
 of Rs 30 per mensem. The
 latter allowance, in ac-
 cordance with rule, was
 not drawn while he
 was in camp, as he then
 drew his travelling allow-
 ance. His travelling allowance
 averaged about Rs 110
 per mensem, which covered
 the keep of his horse while
 he was on tour. While
 stationed at Madras, he
 draws not travelling allow-
 ance. Mr. Ashpitel may therefore
 be regarded as justified
 in saying that Conductor
 Smith is put to loss
 by the refusal to grant
 sub divisional allow-
 ance, & will be put to further
 loss if conveyance allow-
 ance is negatived.

Travelling allow^{ce} should not be held to be a
 source of gain. It should cover average
 actual expenditures on travelling, and
 it should not be is not meant to be
 profitable. I do not think it counts
 for pension.

A.H.

19.3.97

Public Works (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 2066

for Orders

The statement is made in Mr. Ashpitel's letter of 23 Feb. that Mr. Smith ^{will be} put to a loss by
 a refusal to grant him conveyance allow^{ce}. This statement quite correct? The information I
 have is that Mr. Smith formerly got Rs. 300 + Rs. 30, and that he now gets Rs. 300 + Rs. 50 +
 Rs. 20.

Submitted with A.H. 13.3.97

From The Executive Engineer
Light House Division

reference to Mr. Esar's note
 of 12.2.97, on the paper
 filed at E.

In the circumstances
 explained by the Executive
 Engineer, I consider that
 the conveyance allowance
 should be granted.

No. 242

Dated 23rd February '97

Received 24.2.97

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Furnishing, for the considera-
 tion of Government, some
 explanation of the
 necessity for the grant of
 conveyance allowance
 to Conductor Smith
 and Mr. Plummer.

48-6-35, 1155-3, 1163-9, 1193-97

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No. 242

Dated 23^d February 1897.

From

F. W. ASHPITEL, Esq., A.M.I.C.E.,

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,

LIGHT-HOUSE DIVISION,

Madras.

To

THE Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department

SIR,

With reference to your Memo:
no 957C dated 16th February 1897 I have
the honor to inform you that Messrs
Smith and Plummer both maintain
ponies which they will require on
works and which are extremely
useful in Madras where I have to
send them to make enquiries about
the cost of materials at different
shops or to see about the experiments
with concrete blocks at the cement

works

works. I would point out that
Mr. Smith is already put to
loss by the refusal to grant sub
division allowance, and that
if conveyance allowance is also
refused his transfer to this Division
will mean a serious loss of
allowances a result which, I
believe, was not the intention
of Government when the Division
was formed.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obed^t. Servt,

W. H. P. M.
Executive Engineer
Light House D^y.

22/2/97

Cw 2066.

W

This paper has to
be submitted to the
Genl, with reference
to note of 12.2.97.
attached to memo
No 957 C of 16.2.97.

For orders whether
you will express an
opinion on the point.

Cw
2.3.97

In the circumstances
explained I am of the
opinion that the
same should be granted

4/3/97